Public Eye and Private Place: Intimacy and Metatheatre in *Pericles* and *The Tempest*

Bridget Escolme
Queen Mary, University of London

> Lysimachus: ...O, you have heard something of my power and so stand aloof for more serious wooing. But I protest to thee, pretty one, my authority shall not see thee, or else look friendly upon thee. Come, bring me to some private place: come, come.
>
> *Pericles* 4.5.93–97

In this speech from *Pericles*, Lysimachus demands that Marina stops what he is determined to read as playing hard to get, and submit to his sexual desire for her. The line "my authority shall not see thee, or else look friendly on thee" has been glossed by editors as either an implicit or an overt threat.[1] But his "authority" here is given an odd intentionality, suggesting that Lysimachus is already distancing himself from the acts he will soon be made ashamed to have thought of performing. This reading holds Lysimachus's public authority in tension with the private place to which he demands Marina take him: he requires that Marina submit not to his authority as a public figure but to his demands as a private customer of the brothel where she is being held captive. Marina next reminds him that his identity cannot be divided between public and private in this way, by recalling the quality intrinsic both to the successful performance of his public persona and to his self-respect: his honor. She thus persuades him to honor her speech with gold instead of buying her body with it.

In this moment, *Pericles*'s audience is asked to imagine a "private place" in which sexual acts will be performed, and conceptualize a private persona that can hide away from public exposure. In turning Lysimachus from considering his "authority" to what should be inherent in that authority,

Shakespeare Bulletin 36.1: 111–130 © 2018 Johns Hopkins University Press.

his honor, Marina fascinatingly foregrounds the construction of his elite male subjectivity—Lysimachus's "honour" is either born or self-made:

> Marina: If you were born to honour, show it now;
> If put upon you, make the judgement good
> That thought you worthy of it. (4.5.99–101)

In effect, she exposes him both to self-examination and to the audience's critique, where before she has been the object of his gaze, and there follows a potentially comical exchange in which he seems to want both to stay with Marina and to leave the stage, the site of his exposure: he twice gives Marina gold for her virtue rather than for sex, then hurriedly tries to exit but is headed off by the "damned doorkeeper" (128), the brothel worker Bolt.

My reading here is close to Julia Reinhard Lupton's, who glosses Lysimachus's insistence that Marina "bring me to some private place" thus: "lead me away from the terrible visibility opened up by your speech; grant me refuge from the self you have led me to publish". Later, argues Lupton, Lysimachus "actively courts [Marina,] the very woman who has made him reveal the horror of his own frailty"(77); in this context, Lupton cites Hannah Arendt, who writes that courage begins with "leaving one's private place and showing who one is, disclosing and exposing one's self" (Arendt 186, Lupton 77). I want to quote at further length from this pas- sage in Arendt's *The Human Condition*, as it speaks to this article's concern with gender, power and metatheatre. Arendt is discussing the Homeric hero when she writes the following, but her words can be productively applied not only to Lysimachus's sense of exposure but to the female figures in Shakespeare's "Late Plays" that I discuss here:

> The connotation of courage, which we now feel to be an indispensable quality of the hero, is in fact already present in a willingness to act and speak at all, to insert one's self into the world and begin a story of one's own. And this courage is not necessarily or even primarily related to a willingness to suffer the consequences; courage and even boldness are already present in leaving one's private hiding place and showing who one is, in disclosing and exposing one's self (Arendt 186).

In what follows, I am going to use the productions of *Pericles* and *The Tempest* performed at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse (SWP), London, in 2016, as part of a season of Shakespeare's four "Late Plays" or "Romances," to help me think about early modern and current concepts of public and private, intimacy and exposure, particularly as they pertain

to female identity and women's sexuality. I am going to suggest that an inherently metatheatrical performance space like this, in which actors are closely surrounded by an audience in shared lighting, foregrounds a sense of "showing who one is," of "disclosing and exposing one's self" to use Arendt's words, and that this sense becomes particularly acute when it comes to female figures, for whom modesty, chastity and ambivalent relationships to public exposure are so culturally significant.

As Sarah Dustagheer has pointed out, when the SWP, an "archetype" of a Jacobean indoor playhouse (Greenfield 37), was opened in 2014, its perceived "intimacy" was a primary feature of its reception, a quality no doubt foregrounded by the theater's proximity to the "epic" outdoor Globe reconstruction (Dustagheer, "Intimacy"). Interestingly, Shakespeare's Globe has also been described as "intimate" by actors and reviewers, despite its size and physical openness (Billington, Gardner, Shenton). I am particularly interested in the SWP as a theater that produces a strong sense of what I will call metatheatrical intimacy, enabled by the physical proximity of audience to playing space, and shared lighting. I will focus on this, rather than the theater's potential to produce an effect of psychological intimacy or interiority (its acoustic qualities and size allow for lower vocal volumes than at the outdoor Globe and permit, perhaps, a more naturalistic gestural vocabulary). Perhaps, though, the two are inextricable: as I have argued elsewhere, the spectators at the early modern playhouse had both actor and fictional figure simultaneously foregrounded before them (Escolme passim), and in a space that a modern theater goer might call "intimate" they were close to both. Of course, it would be far from accurate to suggest that the intimacy of the indoor playhouse is intrinsic to what *Pericles* and *The Tempest* meant to their first audiences. Even if one wanted to argue that early modern playgoing experience can be recuperated from a modern reconstruction, *Pericles* was written before the King's Men reacquired the Blackfriars. But seeing the plays in a space of intense metatheatrical intimacy such as the SWP, I will argue, both displays and empowers the women in the plays, drawing attention to their states of public-ness and privacy, in ways that foreground gendered power-play on the early modern stage and the relationship of power to notions of public and private.

Intimate Romances

Grouping Shakespeare's four "Late Plays" as "Romances" because of their fairy-tale narratives and redemptive endings effaces the troubling fact that these plays all stage invasions of women's sexual privacy. Con-

stance Jordan may be right to suggest that a play like *Pericles* is "[d]rama- tized in episodes that often lack realistic motivation" (35); but the realism of the brothel scenes in this play are all the more startling by contrast. The romantic-enough twist of Marina's sudden capture by pirates leads to her being sold into prostitution, and, although she resists assaults on her virginity and endangers the business of the brothel by converting its customers to a quasi-religious awe for her eloquence and virtue, the sex traders' language around the selling of women can feel brutally realistic to a modern playgoer or reader. In the other "Romances," Cymbeline's Imogen has her bed chamber invaded by Iachimo and her most intimate sleeping moments watched and recounted as false proof of her lack of chastity. In *The Winter's Tale,* Leontes's obsessive watching of his wife's friendly intimacy with his best friend has seemed so disturbingly psycho- logically "real" to actors that it has led several of them to work modern mental diagnoses into their portrayals of the king.[2] Miranda is obliged to listen to the man who, at least in her father's account, attempted to rape her, wishing he had succeeded and "peopled.../This isle with Cali- bans" (*The Tempest* 1.2.408–10). What does seating close to the stage and shared lighting do to these moments of (at least, often, to modern sensibilities) distasteful and coercive sexual intimacy? Although I focus only on *The Tempest* and *Pericles* in production here, this article proposes broader questions about the theater's contribution to the affective, ethi- cal and gendered meanings of "privacy" and "intimacy" in early modern culture and our own. I suggest that the inherently metatheatrical space of the theater—both indoor and outdoor—was a place where early modern culture might have figured out what public and private could mean—and that the SWP's attempt to re-make such a space in the early twenty-first century allows us to re-visit the ethics of "intimacy" in our own cultural historical terms.

Public/Private: Intimacy and Metatheatre

Early modern English readers had access to writings that defined the "private" in a simple binary with a public that meant "he who holds public office." Robert Hitchcock's translation of Francesco Sansovino's *The Quintessence of Wit*, for example, advises that

> Reason requires, that that Cittizen which is in the state of a priuate person, is affable and curteous with his frends when he doth arise afterwards to beare the title of a Magistrate... (15–16)

or that

> Priuat men in their determinations ought to haue considerations of that which may be profitable for them, but the condition and qualitie of a Prince is of an other sorte, for in their actions they are to haue respecte to their fame and good name. (18)

The second quotation suggests that there is an intrinsic difference between the private citizen and that "observ'd of all observers" (*Hamlet* 3.1.153), the Prince: a difference centered on the public gaze that bestows reputation. The essence of the public figure is that he is responsible for more than just himself. However, in the first quotation it is clear that the private citizen, too, is part of a society, here of his "friends," with whom he has the natural ease of "affable and courteous" relations that should not be abandoned on attaining public office. It is interesting that the positive qualities of the "private" man as stated here have to do with his having "intimates."

In *Bodies and their Spaces: System, Crisis and Transformation in Early Modern Theatre*, Russell West-Pavlov argues that

> It is the extensive permeability of private and public which characterizes the early modern domestic social world. Indeed, this permeability was so self-evident that, strictly speaking, it would have disqualified the use of these adjectives as strictly opposed to one another... (29)

Hitchcock's Sansovino does seem to assume this opposition for men in private and public life, but is exploring the potential problems and benefits of its blurring. West-Pavlov quotes a particularly interesting passage with regards to these concepts as they relate to women, from Richard Brathwait's *The English Gentlewoman* (1631):

> Doe not say, the walls encompass mee, the darknesse o're shadowes mee, the Curtaine of night secures me... doe nothing privately which you would not do publickly. There is no retire from the eyes of God. (Brathwait 49, in West-Pavlov 26)

Here, "public" refers not to public office but means "in public," where others can see; it also connotes "where one's public reputation is at stake." At one level, this advice to women is simply that God sees all. But the exhortation to police and curtail one's private behavior also implies that a woman's behavior should be governed as if her private life is always public, that it is always somehow of public significance, potentially vulnerable to public censure. However, the SWP productions of *Pericles* and *The Tempest* suggested to me that the plays can produce something more am-

bivalent, less inherently containable, in relation to gendered private space, body and sex—those human realms that, by the end of the seventeenth century were to be named "intimate."

Of course, on the early modern English stage male bodies stand in for female ones, partly because opening herself to public gaze in a theater performance would have destroyed a woman's public reputation: the very masculinity of the theater profession helps to produce the female body as "private." But the metatheatrical intimacy of the early modern theater demands not only that fictions of women's lives are played out alongside men's but that actors dressed as women can speak as if female, publicly: in full view of the audience, holding direct eye contact with them and, in the indoor playhouse, very close to them. It is perhaps this that makes that much-cited trope of failed masculinity, the cuckold, such a popular object of derision on the early modern stage: his attempts to keep his young wife from public view are so palpably absurd, when early modern metatheatre makes her always and already a public figure in the theater. I am not arguing that close spaces and shared lighting make for an unproblematically progressive gender politics; recalling the cuckold will immediately bring *Women Beware Women*'s Bianca to mind, who puts herself on public view and is raped very soon afterwards by, to quote from Hitchcock again, one of those "great Princes" who "cannot easily resist their appetites like priuate persons" (2–3). But the following analyses of productions of *Pericles* and *The Tempest* suggest that the potential for the object of the male gaze to render herself a subject by looking back at the audience in an "intimate" theater space foregrounds acts and states of privacy and publicity, complicating the economic and cultural transition of the female from the public to the private sphere which, as West-Pavlov demonstrates, has been a significant recent assumption of cultural historians (West-Pavlov 37, 43).

The Tempest and *Pericles* in Private

As many readers will be aware, the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse was built using the "Worcester College" drawings, unrealized plans for a Restoration theater. The SWP's interior was then designed to capture, as Will Tosh's account of the theater's development relates, the "look and feel" (Tosh Part 1 Ch.1)[3] of an earlier indoor or "private" Jacobean playhouse, one that "Shakespeare might have recognized" (Shakespeare's Globe) during his career. The historical use of the term "private" is of interest here; Keith Sturgess's study, *Jacobean Private Theatre*, suggests

that where the second Blackfriars is called a "private house" by those petitioning against its use as a theater, "private house evidently means what it says: in law, the domestic premises of a private individual, dedicated to his private advantage" (Sturgess, Introduction); in the same period, the term means "a small enclosed playhouse as distinct from the larger, unroofed playhouse like the Globe" (Introduction). As Sturgess goes on to relate, scholars have suggested that the term private was first used by the boys' companies' managers "to camouflage the fact that they were making capital out of the companies of choir boys in their charge," but he argues that that "by the second decade of the seventeenth century private/public meant primarily indoors/outdoors" (Introduction). How far did the early modern theater-going experience of a space like the Blackfriars feel "private"? Will Tosh's analysis of the creation, reception and first productions at the SWP eschews the term entirely. By virtue of ticket prices the Blackfriars was certainly relatively exclusive, and Sarah Dustagheer argues in *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses* that the socio-cultural meanings of "private" theater affected the repertory of the indoor theater, as the Children of the Queen's Revels attempted to preserve a particular tradition of exclusive and royal-approved performance (37–49). Whether audiences felt that a closer relationship might be had with actors and/ or characters than at an outdoor theater is more of a matter for specula- tion. Reviews and theatergoers' online responses to productions at the SWP cite "intimacy," closeness to the performance, and the sense of "specialness" that this creates as a highlight of playgoing there, and this is undoubtedly partially a modern phenomenon. It is not proxemics alone that excites audiences at the SWP, but the unusual experience of watching theater by candlelight. Modern associations of candlelight with romantic closeness on the one hand and, as Will Tosh remarks, Jacobean ghastli- ness on the other (Tosh Part 1 Ch 2), appear to play an important role in creating the ambiguous sense of "intimacy" intrinsic to seeing theater here, whereas candles were the quotidian lighting technology of the early modern household after dark and likely created less excitement. But as I turn to the *Pericles* and *Tempest* production case studies, I do not want to suggest that the SWP has recuperated early modern playgoing experience, so much as that watching figures such as Miranda and Marina on the "intimate" SWP stage draws attention to effects of metatheatrical intimacy and invites a self-reflexivity that is particularly significant for my consideration of female subjectivity and the public, private, and "intimate" in *The Tempest* and *Pericles*.

The Tempest

This production fascinatingly drew focus to Miranda (Phoebe Price), whose performance created a continually shifting sense of looking and, to borrow from Laura Mulvey and film studies, "to-be-looked-at-ness" (Mulvey 11). The play's opening storm was created using a hand-operated "scene" of wooden waves, wheeled out from the theater's "discovery space," that served as Prospero (Tim McMullan)'s cell; a large lantern full of candles was swung from the ceiling by Ariel (Pippa Nixon) like a little lost ship; actors positioned around the auditorium shouted the seamen's lines, whilst others flung themselves into the balustrade of the first gallery, creating the illusion for the audience of being on the ship itself. All of this was preceded by a pre-set sequence in which Miranda wandered about the stage as her father worked in his cell. We examined her as she examined the island, looking about her, lying down to gaze at the sky/auditorium, retreating to the cell when musical instruments begun to indicate the storm, finally standing at the front of the stage as it ended, a strik- ingly tall figure, exposed before us as she witnessed, perhaps for the first time, that her father's power could be destructive as well as protective. The single piece of set here—a rock-like feature center stage—worked to expose her still further later in the play, as she stood up on it to avoid Caliban and to upbraid him for his treatment of her.

The Tempest stages moments where Miranda's intimacies with Ferdinand are watched by her unseen father, and in this production, in her last, celebrated moment of spied-on intimacy, Miranda was revealed cozily tucked away in the SWP's "discovery space" upstage playing chess with Ferdinand. The scene read to me as though Miranda, having spent much of the play in an ambiguous state of power and/or vulnerability center stage, had been safely domesticized, protected from public display (and the grasps of Caliban) as a good wife should be. Despite the fact that, in the chess scene, the dialogue depicts her as a gently teasing equal to Ferdinand, in this archetype of an early modern indoor playhouse it was hard to escape the gender power politics of public and private, vulner-ability and display. In public, this female figure is vulnerable, and what we now might call her "intimate" self has been exposed to the public's, and Caliban's, gaze. She is much safer in the discovery space (where those in the cheaper seats in fact cannot see her), joking with her future husband. However, when this production placed Miranda at the center of this intimate room with all eyes upon her it did not, I think, merely objectify her. She began and ended the play with a powerful gaze of her

own, out onto the destruction her father has wreaked and out onto the men of Milan and Naples as she emerged from the discovery space to wonder at the "brave new world that has such people in it" (5.1.205–6). As John Kunat points out in his study of "Rape, Race and Conquest in *The Tempest*":

> Usually the gaze is an instrument whereby "the male, as appropriate bearer of the look" fixes the woman as an object of desire; in romance, a struggle between men often occurs over who had first appropriated a particular woman with his gaze...But in *The Tempest*, the gaze is transformed into a medium of mutual recognition; it is Miranda who is first transfixed by gazing on Ferdinand, urged on by her father. (Kunat 317, citing Freedman 2)

Here, the "mutual recognition" of the gaze was shiftingly transferred onto relations between Miranda and the audience, who laughed warmly at her enjoyment of the men— so that she was at once displayed as the object of Caliban's, and potentially Stephano's, violent desire—and the audience's sympathetic "intimate" with, like them, a gaze of her own.

Depth and height are important producers of meaning in this playhouse. The "intimate" quality of the SWP, as Dustagheer demonstrates, is created by the sense of shared space in this theater, often described by actors as a "room" shared by performer and audience ("Intimacy" 234, 237–8). Actors sometimes chat with audience members before the play begins (as happened in *Pericles*), then appeal to them, share jokes with them, conspire with them throughout the performance. Those sitting in the pit also get to be amongst the privileged intimates of the actors, as characters enter through the audience and perform dialogue there. There is no evidence to suggest that early modern actors entered through or spoke from the pit, but the SWP's use of the audience entrance and playing space extends the logic of Weimann's locus and platea in this "Jacobean archetype" of a playhouse; enough theatrical and scholarly attention has been paid to the seductiveness of villain figures who address the audience—Richard III, Iago, Edmund—to suggest that sharing conspiratorial looks and "asides," jokes, and commentary with them produces a metatheatrical intimacy that is inherently enjoyable despite the moral status of the character who offers them. In the SWP *Tempest*, Stephano (Trevor Fox) and Trinculo (Dominic Rowan) entered, creating much comic disruption, through the pit, as did Fisayo Akinade's Caliban: indeed, Caliban stayed in the pit whilst expressing his wish to have peopled the isle with Calibans, as Miranda stood exposed the rock above, an icon of the chastity he wanted to violate. As Will Tosh relates, this

scenographic element was introduced to encourage actors to use center stage at the SWP, where some audience sight lines are poor (Tosh Part 2 Ch 4); it had the effect of drawing attention to center stage as a place of both power and vulnerability in this theater. Caliban's position amongst the audience in the pit afforded himself intimacy with the audience even whilst speaking his least empathetic lines.

The racial politics of *The Tempest* are a recurring problem for the modern production of this play. Directors since Margaret Webster in 1945 and Jonathan Miller in 1970 have frequently cast actors of color in both the Ariel and Caliban roles, emphasizing the power relations of proto-colonizer over colonized at work between Prospero and the islanders. But however empathetically the actor performs Caliban's "This island's mine" or "Be not afraid" speeches, at the end of the play the audience is asked, it often seems, to accept the forgiveness of a black slave by a white master as a somehow unproblematically redemptive ending for both. At the SWP, Fisayo Akinade's Caliban, described in Eleanor Collins's review as "gentle..., sweetly enthusiastic about his ridiculous new master" when he meets Stephano, began his performance down with the audience in the pit—symbolic of his position in the island's power structure but also affording him metatheatrical intimacy with the audience. On the one hand, the "Jacobean" structure of the playhouse and its display of Miranda's chaste "modesty," the "jewel in [her] dower" (3.1.64) that Caliban set out to spoil, might be said to reiterate the racist trope of dangerous black male sexuality and white female innocence; after all, the play stages a prototype for this trope, inescapable in modern production where a person of colour is cast as Caliban, unless one cuts his "peopled else/ This isle" lines. What this playhouse's intimate metatheatricality offers, however, is a multivalence for the relationship between Caliban, Miranda, and audience, where the image of Caliban looking up at Miranda can be simultaneously read as man objectifying woman and white colonialist looking down at black slave. At the same time, the audience is implicated in this act of looking by their intimate connection to the action. We are visibly staged looking at Miranda along with Caliban.

This production of *The Tempest* used the metatheatrical intimacy of the SWP to foreground the audience's gaze upon Miranda and Caliban and drew attention to Miranda's privacy and public-ness as a gendered subject. Protected by her father, exposed to ours and Caliban's view, this "intimate" space allowed Miranda the force of her own gaze—at her father's destructiveness, at Ferdinand and Caliban, at us. In placing Caliban in intimate physical proximity to audience members in the pit,

the production also offered them a relationship with him as a human agent, rather than the "monster" he is so often named in the play, or the villain that Miranda does not "love to look on" (1.2.364). I now turn to the *Pericles* of the same SWP season, a play which makes yet more of the to-be-looked-at-ness of a central female character and emphasizes even more clearly her gendered public/private subjectivity.

Pericles

Joanne Tompkins argues that the production of *Pericles* which took place at Shakespeare's Globe in 2005 was highly conscious of its work as a theatrical heterotopia that references the world outside of the theater and shows how that world might perform itself otherwise (Tompkins 107–38). The SWP version in 2016, on the other hand, seemed, for Peter Kirwan in his review of the production, to be looking inwards to personal reconciliation and redemption where it might have looked outwards to the global stage (Kirwan, "Review"). However, I argue here that the metatheatrical intimacy of the production managed to create its own heterotopia, one that foregrounded the dual state of intimacy and display that I want to suggest are inherent to *Pericles*'s constructions of gender, class, and power, and are comparably significant for our own cultural moment.

Where the SWP *Tempest* was costumed in Jacobean style, the *Pericles* cast wore simple, white dresses and shirts, loose white or beige trousers and sandals, chatted to the audience and sung a rousing sea-shanty before the opening of the play. The overall effect was of a theater company telling a story in simple, modern summer dress, with additional pieces, more historically and geographically inflected, in oranges, browns and reds, donned for the play itself. As in *The Tempest*, the first moment of the play proper, Gower's Prologue, took place in darkness: as the opening "Bound for the Bay of Biscay" shanty ended, the company swung lowered candelabras into the middle of the stage and made comic play of the sound of quickly blowing out all of the candles. Gower was played by Sheila Reid, who spoke the lines in the tone of a good-humoured grandmother to whose audience/children everything needs a bit of explanation; she first entered from the trap in the stage with her own candle, a tiny spotlight for a bedtime story in the darkness. "From ashes ancient Gower is come" (Prologue 2) she smiled, and her entrance became a wry comment on the medieval poet having risen from the grave. The metatheatricality of play and playhouse was foregrounded from the outset, the production of theatrical illusion self-consciously staged.

Pericles' arrival at Antiochus's palace and his witnessing of the beauty of the King's incest-blighted daughter was then performed in semi-darkness, each actor holding their own candlelight source, the Daughter's attached to her wrists like manacles. The effect was one of sinister mystery: Matilda Leyser's Daughter recalled Marlowe's conjured spirit of Helen of Troy as she glided onto the stage—a beauty we could not quite see, whose presence related deeds done in darkness. Antiochus held her possessively by the shoulder and turned her face to Pericles for his better view, as if controlling how she was to be seen. She was literally a body onto whom men inscribe meaning: the riddle Pericles solves was written on her back. This contrasted with our introduction to Pericles' future wife Thaisa: candle-lit as brightly as is possible in this space, she was sat up on a high chair like a modern umpire to watch the jousting that takes place at her father's court in her honour. It was immediately clear that Simonides presents his daughter's beauty openly "for men to see and seeing wonder at" (2.2.7) but that she also sees and judges herself, choosing Pericles and gazing upon him, getting a laugh from the audience on both occasions I saw the piece on a line addressed directly to the auditorium: "All viands that I eat do seem unsavoury,/ Wishing him my meat" (2.3.33–4).

Thaisa's reading of the mottos on the knights' shields was staged as a quiz to test her erudition—Dorothea Meyer-Bennett looked at the image on each shield then, in this production, guessed the motto on the back before it was revealed to her. She was able to decipher emblems and inscriptions, whereas Antiochus's daughter was inscribed upon. In this production there was less of the sense of surveillance of father by daughter that was produced by Prospero appearing from the darkness at the SWP to comment to the audience on Miranda and Ferdinand's private moments. In *Pericles*, Simonides' pretended reluctance at the match between Pericles and Thaisa is short-lived and here he laughed uproariously at his own joke in keeping his approval momentarily from the lovers. The dance performed at the Tharsus banquet was openly sexual, with the jousting knights on show first of all, dancing a macho parody of the fights they have just undertaken; the women then slowly beckoned the men into a couple dance of stylized but overtly sensual stroking. One couple disrupted all this courtly sensuality by nearly falling into the lower gallery for a kiss, at which point Simonides stopped the party. Pericles's first two journeys took him to a land of hidden, abusive, power-based and voyeuristic sexuality, then on to one of joyously open congress and mutual "to-be-looked-at-ness."

The production used an aesthetic produced by the SWP stage and auditorium itself to solve the problem of consistency of tone and narrative so often cited in scholarly and journalistic criticism of this play and generally ascribed to joint authorship. The impression instantly created by the Gower figure was of a tale told in a darkened room full of eager listeners. The storm in which Marina is born and Thaisa supposedly lost was, as for *The Tempest*, a low-tech *coup de théâtre*, Pericles shouting his speech "The god of this great vast, rebuke these surges" (3.1.1–14) over a percussive score of drums and sheet metal, whilst teetering on a narrow plank extending into the pit from the stage supported only by fine ropes suspended from the upper gallery, to which he clung as though to the ropes of a ship. The play's untidily episodic narrative read as a great epic told in a small room. The "intimacy" of the space and its visible contemporary audience drew modern parallels, challenging Peter Kirwan's sense that the production's redemptive tone erases them: where Syria is mentioned, actors playing Cleon and Dionysa's starving subjects evoked the current refugee crisis. This sense of being both in a room with the narrative of this play, and experiencing its references to world outside of it, both foregrounded by the intrinsic metatheatricality of the story-telling Gower figure, gave a particular theatrical power to the figure of Marina, the third woman in the play to be displayed on stage, who suffers an acute threat to her "privacy."

In his chapter on "The 'Woman as Wonder' Trope," Michele Marrapodi suggestively figures Marina as both an icon of chastity, foil to the sexual corruption of the silent Daughter of Antiochus, and a forceful psychological subject. He cites Inga-Stina Ewbank's essay on the language of recognition in *Pericles*, remarking that Marina "is not only chaste and innocent but also endowed with a gift for plain and basically naturalistic speech" (Marrapodi 197). Ewbank suggests that she figures in the recognition scene "not primarily as a symbol of 'sweet harmony' but as a vigorous heroine of social comedy, capable of working through words on people's minds" (Ewbank 117, in Marrapodi 197). Here, I want to draw out Marrapodi and Ewbank's implication that Marina is simultaneously gendered archetype and social agent. She is, in Marrapodi and Ewbank's words respectively, not "only chaste and innocent" and "not primarily" a symbol. She always and inevitably is those things, because she must stand on stage as not Antiochus's corrupted daughter and not the prostitute Bolt and Bawd would make her. But if a female figure on the early modern stage wants to be more than an element in the madonna/whore binary, she had better keep talking; Marina, as Marrapodi

and Ewbank so suggestively explain, does so in the most literal fashion, reforming Lysimachus "simply by affirming her own testimony of life and by refusing all ambiguities, understatement, and amphibologies...that are typical of oblique communication" (Marrapodi 197). In counterbalance to Antiochus's daughter, she refuses to be merely symbolic. The first female counterpoint and potential partner to Pericles is that daughter, a silent figure without a name, the answer to a riddle to be read by men; the second, Thaisa, is her virtuous opposite and a reader of emblems herself; his third female counterpoint is his own daughter Marina, who speaks in most literal terms, whilst simultaneously standing in for, and up for, virtue and chastity. She also suggests that she might work for a living, refusing the "trade" into which her captors attempt to force her and offering them instead her economic potential as a teacher of singing, sewing, weaving and dancing. She is not either a symbol of vice or virtue or a "real" figure of female social life and discourse, but both.

The sense that women on display in this space can be both gazer and gazed-at lent immediate theatrical power to Jessica Baglow's Marina here. However, her status and strength were repeatedly under attack in the play's sex-trafficking scenes, when performers skilled in comic timing and the use of metatheatrical intimacy lightened her encounters with the brothel workers to the point of potentially obliterating the disturbing gender politics of these scenes. When Marina is on the verge of death at the hands of her stepmother Dionysa's henchman Leonine, her sudden capture by a gang of pirates was delightfully cartoon-like at the SWP. Foregrounding the improbability of this play's "tall tale" narrative, the pirates leaped onto the stage from the pit, whisking Marina away in comically peremptory style and setting a lightness of tone for the remains of her captivity. Sold by the pirates to be an economically valuable prostitute—a beautiful, well-spoken woman with some great clothes (4.2.49–51) —she is made to stand on display as her sexual desirability as an enforced prostitute is discussed. At the SWP, Pandar, Bawd and Bolt, from their first entrances, managed the comic metatheatricality of contact with the audience and improvisation with the text so successfully that Marina's force as a sign of female resistance was occasionally in danger of collapsing: she became not only an object of lust and sale but an object of the sex workers' comedy.

Act four, scene two of *Pericles* begins with the brothel workers' discussion of their need for new human objects of sale. At the SWP, any distaste that might be felt by a modern audience at tales of disease-ridden prostitutes, worn out with use, was dissipated by the use of improvisation.

When Bawd declares

> We were never so much out of creatures. We have but poor three, and they can do no more than they can do; and they with continual action are even as good as rotten. (4.2.6–9)

Dennis Herdman's endearingly daft cockney Bolt interrupted the source text with the modern interjection, "You can't do more than you can do, why would you try?" When Bawd claimed she has brought up no less than eleven bastards (15), Pandar queried this with increasing incredulity, repeating "Eleven? Eleven? Eleven?" to much audience laughter. And when Pandar offered a complex explanation of their economic plight—"O, our credit comes not in like the commodity, nor the commodity wages not with the danger" (4.2.31–3)— Bawd simply blocked him with "What?," after which Pandar exasperatedly repeated the line's key terms ("Credit! Commodity! Commodity! Credit! Wages! Danger!") as if this would help Pandar understand it. The improvisation was a sure comic winner in its implication that we were all finding the early modern language of this play—and indeed the language of economics—challenging. Audiences seemed to love these irreverent tamperings with the Shakespearean text. Once they had happened, Bawd's vicious grabbing of Marina's crotch on the line "I think I shall have something to do with you" (90–91), when they were alone on stage, simply served to make the male brothel workers all the more comic and unthreatening by contrast. Significantly, it was Bawd who had also peremptorily cupped Marina's breasts as her saleable qualities were being discussed earlier in the scene, as if abusive behavior towards Marina by the men on stage would have spoiled the levity of the moment. The comic, metatheatrical relationship between the brothel owners and the audience allowed the comedy of their increasing exasperation at Marina's refusal to conform to her trafficked state to erase even the violence of the exchange in which Bawd orders Bolt to rape Marina:

> Bawd: Bolt, take her away; use her at thy pleasure:
> crack the glass of her virginity, and make the rest malleable.
> Bolt: An if she were a thornier piece of ground than she
> is, she shall be ploughed. (4.5.151–5)

How "early modern" are improvisations of this kind? Whatever the precise history of Shakespeare's clowns and their improvisatory habits—however determined Hamlet's or Letoy from *The Antipodes*' advice to the players about lengthy extempore exchanges—I would argue that an "intimate"

theater of shared actor/audience light lends itself to improvisatory moments.[4] Although here Bawd and Bolt's improvised lines were not often addressed directly to the audience, they produce audience sympathy because of their implied reference to the audience's experience of the difficult 400-year-old text.

In *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Performance*, Kim Solga argues that

> rape's dramatic representation among the early moderns reflects not what a modern audience might understand about the experience – the victim's heinous bodily and psychic suffering – but rather what rape means to those to whom it is reported, who can access it only as vicarious witnesses but who also bear the heavy responsibility to absolve the victim of any potential complicity and to mobilize the force of the law (31).

In Marina's case, rape is threatened but verbally averted by the potential victim who acts as her own force of resistance. At the SWP she stopped Lysimachus not only with her words but with the steadiness of her stance and a hand to his chest. Of course, one could argue that the play is merely suggesting that those who fall victim to rape are complicit because they are not virtuous enough to resist it. But in the economy of intimacy and display produced in this playhouse, power is afforded to those who appear to be dictating the terms by which they are displayed on stage; and this determinedly calm Marina did remarkably effective work resisting comic object-hood as the brothel workers improvised around her, and she finally produces Lysimachus as a comic object himself. The play moves from a daughter displayed to her suitors as a silent answer to a riddle and to the audience as a spectacle of corrupted lust, to a daughter who speaks, works, acts for herself. As Edel Semple points out, Marina continues to earn for the brothel, albeit as a teacher of feminine work and accomplishment rather than as a prostitute (Semple 204). For Semple, the brothel-workers' economic need is foregrounded alongside their sinfulness: "bawdry is shown to be driven by self-preservation and economic need" (204), and Marina is not permitted an escape from that need by the play. Melissa E. Sanchez also remarks that the fruits of Marina's "honest" labor "nonetheless go toward sustaining a house of sin" (106). She suggests that the play's "collapse of prostitution, honest employment, and marriage troubles any neat distinction between the cynical corruption of Antiochus' daughter and the earnest integrity of Marina" (106). However, the distinction, if not neat on the page, is clear in the SWP. For whilst Antiochus's daughter appears as an object of the male gaze on stage, and

the audience's gaze in the playhouse, Thaisa performs her own distinctive gaze and Marina gets to enact her own fate through work and language. Admittedly, the comic, subaltern figures of the brothel-workers were cast in Semple's vein of self-preservation and were rendered relatively empathetic by their connection with the audience despite the brutality of their trade. Yet Marina's defiant gaze and talking-back, both at the on-stage men that would buy her and at us in the audience, foregrounded the audience members as Solga's "vicarious witnesses," encouraging them to determine their own subject position in relation to the action.

This examination of Marina, Miranda and, in passing, Caliban on stage in an "intimate" candle-lit playhouse has begun to explore the relationship between metatheatre and intimacy in productions of early modern drama. Theater production can be a way in to thinking about early modern culture's discourses of public and private—and the soon-to-emerge concept of intimacy, which comes to mean both a positive closeness and a sexual privacy always on the verge of exposure. I opened with Marina's exposure on stage of Lysimachus's coercive desire for her, in his demand she retreat with him to a "private place." As a result, he himself is exposed where he would rather remain private, an exposure that becomes unnervingly relevant in a year when the coercive sexuality of a number of men in the arts and public life has been revealed. The "intimate" playhouse of close contact and shared lighting between performer and audience creates, to borrow again from Arendt, a theater of "leaving one's private place and showing who one is, disclosing and exposing one's self" (186). The female figures in these plays are both gazers and objects of the gaze; the metatheatricality bestowed by close audiences and shared light can produce a theatrical self-reflexivity that allows them still to challenge us.

Notes

[1]See Suzanne Gossett's *Pericles* for the Arden Shakespeare, 4.v.n.93–4; Doreen Del Veccio and Anthony Hammond for the New Cambridge Shakespeare, 4.v.n.83. The editors of the Oxford Shakespeare's reconstructed version, which includes phrases and passages from Wilkins's *Painful Adventures*, argue that "Q's very abbreviated scene was the result of censorship of the much longer version that Wilkins's narrative reports" (19.n.96); they reconstruct the lines using Q1 and Wilkins, giving Lysimachus a longer speech which clearly states that he, as governor, may do whatever he pleases.

[2]For example, Anthony Sher in the RSC production, directed by Greg Doran (1999) and David Edwards in the Common Ground production, directed by Tom Cornford (2014).

[3]For the dating of the Worcester College drawings see Gordon Higgott's unpublished work, referenced in Oliver Jones, "Documentary Evidence for An Indoor Jacobean Theatre," in Gurr and Karim-Cooper n.38, p. 71.

[4]For a list of citations demonstrating that improvisation continued to be part of clowning performance beyond Shakespeare's *Hamlet* or Brome's *The Antipodes* (see The Antipodes 2.1.93–9 for Letoy's invective against extempore acting) and as late as 1673, when Aphra Benn has cause to complain of it, see Kettnich 129–30. See also Sam Plumb's blog on improvisation as indicated in early modern playtexts.

Works Cited

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. U of Chicago P, 1998.

Billington, Michael. "Review *of Two Gentlemen of Verona*, directed by Jack Shepherd." *Guardian* 26 August 1996, Section 2, p.9.

Brathwait, Richard. *The English Gentlewoman Drawn out to the Full Body: Expressing What Habiliments Do Best Attire Her, What Ornaments Do Best Adorne Her, What Accomplishments Do Best Accomplish Her*. Lon- don, 1631, Early English Books Online.

DelVecchio, Doreen and Antony Hammond, notes to William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, edited by Doreen DelVecchio and Anthony Hammond. Cambridge UP, 1998. pp. 79–82.

Dustagheer, Sarah. *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses: Repertory and Theatre Space at the Globe and the Blackfriars 1599–1613*. Cambridge UP, 2017.

Dustagheer, Sarah. "'Intimacy' at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse." *Shakespeare Bulletin* vol. 35, no. 2, 2017, pp. 227–46.

Collins, Eleanor. "Timeless Magic." Review of *The Tempest*, directed by Dominic Dromgoole, *Around the Globe*, no. 63, Summer 2016.

Edwards, David. "Obsessions, Compulsions and Contagion: A Psycho-Physical Approach to Performance." Theatres of Contagion: Infectious Performance, 11 May 2017, Birkbeck University of London. Conference presentation.

Escolme, Bridget. *Talking to the Audience: Shakespeare, Performance, Self*. Routledge, 2005.

Ewbank, Inga-Stina, '"My Name is Miranda': the language of recognition." *Shakespeare's Styles, Essays in Honour of Kenneth Muir*, edited by Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank and G.K. Hunter. Cambridge UP, 1980, pp.131–130.

Freedman, Barbara. *Staging the Gaze: Postmodernism, Psychoanalysis and Shake- spearean Comedy*. Cornell UP, 1991.

Gardner, Lyn. "King of the Globe." *Guardian*, 2 August 2000, www.theguardian.com/culture/2000/aug/02/artsfeatures. Accessed 5 July 2017.

Greenfield, Jon (with assistance from Peter McCurdy). "Practical evidence for a reimagined indoor Jacobean theatre," *Moving Shakespeare Indoors: Performance and Repertoire in the Jacobean Playhouse*, edited by Andrew Gurr and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 32–64.

Higgott, Gordon. "Reassessing the drawings for the Inigo Jones theatre: a Restoration project by John Webb?." *The Chamber of Demonstrations: Reconstructing the Jacobean Indoor Playhouse*, edited by Martin White, 2005, *www.bristol. ac.uk/drama/jacobean/research4.html*. Accessed 29 Oct. 2017.

Hitchcock, Robert. *The Quintescence of wit being a corrant comfort of conceites, max- imies, and poleticke deuises, selected and gathered together by Francisco Sansouino*. London, 1590, *Early English Books Online*.

Jordan, Constance. *Shakespeare's Monarchies*. Cornell UP, 1997.

Kettnich, Karen. '"Now mark that fellow; he speaks Extempore': Scripted Improvisation in The Antipodes." *Early Theatre*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2007, pp. 129–39.

Kirwan, Peter. Review of *Pericles*, directed by Dominic Dromgoole, November 29, 2015. blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/bardathon/2015/11/29/pericles-shakespeares-globe-the-sam-wanamaker-playhouse/. Accessed 7 July 2017.

Kunat, John, "'Play me false': Rape, Race and Conquest in *The Tempest*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 3, Fall 2016, pp. 307–27.

Lupton, Julia Reinhard, "Shakespeare Dwelling: *Pericles* and the Affordances of Action." *Shakespeare and the Urgency of Now: Criticism and Theory in the 21st Century*, edited by Cary DiPietro and Hugh Gray, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Marrapodi, Michele "The Woman as Wonder Trope." *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literary Theories*, edited by Michele Marrapodi, Ashgate, 2011.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1975, pp. 6–18.

Pericles. William Shakespeare, directed by Kathryn Hunter, Shakespeare's Globe, London, 2 June-1 October 2005.

Pericles, Prince of Tyre. William Shakespeare and George Wilkins, directed by Dominic Dromgoole, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, London, 19 November 2015—21 April 2016.

Sanchez, Melissa E. *Erotic Subjects: The Sexuality of Politics in Early Modern English Literature*. Oxford UP, 2011.

Semple, Edel. "Rethinking Transgression with Shakespeare's Bawds." *Staged Transgression in Shakespeare's England*, edited by Rory Loughnane and Edith Semple, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 194–208.

"Sam Wanamaker Playhouse: Press Pack, January 2014." *Shakespeare's Globe*. www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/files/2014/02/sam_wanamaker_playhouse_press_pack_january_2014_final.pdf. 2014. Accessed 15 July 2017.

Shakespeare, William. *Pericles*, edited by Suzanne Gossett, Arden Shakespeare, 2004. pp. 407–13

Shakespeare, William, and George Wilkins. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. *The RSC Shakespeare: Complete Works*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. *The RSC Shakespeare: Complete Works*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Shenton, Mark. "Smart Ass: Classical Theatre Superstar Mark Rylance tells Mark Shenton how Shakespeare's Globe lets him be Intimate with Audiences." *Sunday Express*, 4 Aug. 2002, pp. 54–55.

Solga, Kim. *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Performance: Invisible Acts*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Sturgess, Keith. *The Jacobean Private Playhouse*. Routledge, 1987.

Tempest, The. William Shakespeare, directed by Dominic Dromgoole, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, London, 17 February 2016–22 April 2016.

Tompkins, Joanne. *Theatre's Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Tosh, Will. *Playing Indoors: Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse*. Bloomsbury, 2018.

Warren, Roger, notes to *A Reconstructed Text of Pericles, Prince of Tyre, by William Shakespeare and George Wilkins*, edited by Roger Warren on the basis of a text prepared by Gary Taylor and MacD. P. Jackson. Oxford UP, 2003.

West-Pavlov, Russell. *Bodies and their Spaces: System, Crisis and Transformation in Early Modern Theatre*. Rodopi, 2006.

Weimann, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.